# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/083,319 | 10/19/2001 | Ravi Narayanan | O&L 1000-1070 | 4118 |

7590       05/20/2005

KERMIT D. LOPEZ / LUIS M. ORTIZ
ORTIZ & LOPEZ PLLC
P.O. BOX 4484
ALBUQUERQUE, NM  87196-4484

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| DOAN, DUYEN MY |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2143 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>14 May 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 October 2001</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

*Detail Action*

Claims 1-32 are presented for examination.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 27, 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Hind et al (us 2002/0161801) (hereinafter Hind) in view of

Gupner et al (us pat 6195709).

**As regarding claim 1**, Hind discloses routing said object over said distributed

computer network utilizing an object router, which can parse said object and apply said

associated processing information contained within said object, thereby permitting said

object router to become self-programmed for varying data formats (see Hind paragraph

33-34, pg.4). Hind does not expressly disclose designating an object which comprises

a self-contained module of data and associated processing information.

Gupner teaches designating an object which comprises a self-contained module

of data and associated processing information (col.1, lines 45-47).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Gupner to the method of Hind to have the object being self-contain for the purpose of easier to debug, maintain, and enhance object oriented software (see Gupner col.1, lines 60-61).

**As regarding claim 2**, Hind-Gupner discloses object router comprises an object-oriented router (see Hind paragraph 33-34, pg.4, XML is an instant of object oriented).

**As regarding claim 11**, Hind-Gupner discloses associated processing information comprises at least one software method (see Hind pg.4, paragraph 33-34, software or instructions for carrying out the translation).

**As regarding claim 14**, Hind-Gupner discloses object router can route proprietary data (see Hind pg.3, paragraph 19-20).

**As regarding claim 15**, Hind-Gupner discloses object router can route standard data (see Hind pg.3, paragraph 19-20).

**As regarding claim 17**, the limitations are similar to limitations of claim 1 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 1.

**As regarding claim 18**, the limitations are similar to limitations of claim 2 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 2.

**As regarding claim 27**, the limitations are similar to limitations of claim 11 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 11.

**As regarding claim 30**, the limitations are similar to limitations of claim 14 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 14.

**As regarding claim 31**, the limitations are similar to limitations of claim 15 therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 15.

Claims 3-10, 12-13, 16, 19-26, 28-29, 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hind and Gupner as applied to claim1 above, and further in view of Hossain (us 2002/0133532).

**As regarding claim 3**, Hind-Gupner discloses all the limitation of claim 1 above but the combination does not disclose object router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source.

Hossain teaches object router to construct said object by dynamically downloading said associated processing information corresponding to data received from an external data source (see Hossain pg.3, paragraph 37-38).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teaching of Hossain to the method of Hind-Gupner to receive the processing data from external source for the purpose of easier to maintain or enhance the routers.

**As regarding claim 4**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses constructing said object utilizing an end device by packaging said data and said associated processing information; and transmitting said object to said object router (see Gupner col.3, lines 11-67).

**As regarding claim 5**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses routing said data and said associated processing information utilizing an object router, such that said data and said associated processing information may be utilized by a subsequent object router to continue routing said data further through said distributed computer network (see Hind pg.4, paragraph 33-34).

**As regarding claim 6**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses subsequent object router comprises a next-hop object router (see Hind pg.4, paragraph 33, plurality of routers).

**As regarding claim 7**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses downloading other associated processing information utilizing a received object; and thereafter constructing a new object (see Hind paragraph 33-34, also see Hossain pg.3, paragraph 37-38).

**As regarding claim 8**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses object router can utilize said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to download said other set of associated processing information (see Hossain pg.3, paragraph 37-38, downloading instructions from other source or internal source). The same motivation was utilized in claim 3 applied equally well to claim 8.

**As regarding claim 9**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses object router can utilize said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to download said other set of associated processing information to augment current associated processing information (see Hossain pg.3, paragraph 37-38, downloading instructions from other source or internal source). The same motivation was utilized in claim 3 applied equally well to claim 9.

**As regarding claim 10**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses object router can utilize

said data or said associated processing information embedded in said object to

download said other set of associated processing information to replace said current

associated processing information (see Hind pg.4, paragraph 33-34, translating from

one format to other format).

**As regarding claim 12**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses at least one software

method is present within said object (see Gupner col.1, lines 45-47). The same

motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 12.

**As regarding claim 13**, Hind-Gupner-Hossain discloses at least one software

method is associated with said object (see Gupner col.1, lines 45-47). The same

motivation was utilized in claim 1 applied equally well to claim 13.

**As regarding claim 16**, the limitations of claim 16 are the combinations of claims

3-7, therefore rejected for the same rationales as above.

**As regarding claims 19-26,** the limitations are similar to claims 3-10

respectively, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 3-10.

**As regarding claim 28-29**, the limitations are similar to claims 12-13

respectively, therefore rejected for the same rationale as claims 12-13.

**As regarding claim 32**, the limitations of claim 32 are similar to claim 16,

therefore rejected for the same rationale as claim 16.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duyen M. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4226. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Examiner
Duyen Doan
Art unit 2143

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100